

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action dated March 25, 2008.

Claims 1 and 3 are amended, claim 2 is canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1 and 3 remain pending in this application.

§101 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-functional descriptive material, specifically toward a "data structure." Applicant has cancelled claim 2 in the interests of moving prosecution forward. Applicant does not disclaim any patentable subject matter encompassed by cancelled claim 2 and respectfully reserves the right to pursue claim 2 in an identical or similar form at a later date in a continuing or divisional application.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as lacking the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicant has amended claim 3 to include the requested hardware elements. Entry of these amendments and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claim 3 is respectfully requested.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for anticipation by Horn et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0156688).

As noted above, Applicant has cancelled claim 2 in the interests of moving prosecution forward. Applicant does not disclaim any patentable subject matter encompassed by cancelled claim 2 and respectfully reserves the right to pursue claim 2 in an identical or similar form at a later date in a continuing or divisional application.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abjanic (U.S. Patent No. 6,732,175; hereinafter "Abjanic") in view of Horn et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0156688; hereinafter "Horn").

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to clarify that the key values are related to a transaction, and thus not a particular product. More specifically, Applicant has amended the claim to clarify that the received electronic data is produced by the two or more different software systems and that the key values included in this data are used to identify the transaction of one software system to the transaction identifier. The result is that the key values from any of the individual two or more software systems may be used to retrieve all documentation items relating to a transaction, even the documentation items produced and received from another one of the two or more software systems. Applicant respectfully submits that Abjanic and Horn fail to provide such a method and, if combined, the combination provides a different method or system entirely.

The Office Action admits on page 6 that Abjanic fails to teach using the at least one key value to look up a unique transaction identifier associated with the transaction, wherein the transaction includes on unique transaction identifier and two or more associated key values. Horn is provided to cure this deficiency. Applicant respectfully traverses, but also submits that the amendments further clarify the distinction between independent claim 1 and Horn.

In particular, the Office Action asserts on page 7 that paragraph [0521] of Horn provides a teaching “that queries may be used to identify the purchase of a particular product during a particular shopping session. Thus, the ItemID can be used to identify a Unique Transaction ID.” However, what this paragraph seems to be saying is that transactions including a purchase of a product may be retrieved using the product ID. There may be unique transaction, but this is not saying that a product is purchased in only one transaction. Thus, a single ItemID may be associated with many Unique Transaction ID’s. This is simply not the same as a key value used to identify the transaction within one of the two or more different software systems from which the electronic data relating to the transaction was received. The asserted combination in the Office Action based on the ItemID would result in multiple transactions on one of the two or more software systems to be related with a single transaction on a system performing the method of the claim. Although such a system may be useful in certain contexts, it is different from the method of claim 1 where all documentation items relating to a transaction are retrievable using one of the key values of the two or more different software systems from which the electronic data relating to the transaction was received.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Abjanic and Horn fails to teach or suggest electronic data received from two or more different software systems including a key value used in a respective software system to identify the transaction and indexing the key values with a unique transaction identifier to make all documentation items relating to a transaction retrievable using one of the key values of the two or more different software systems from which the electronic data relating to the transaction was received. Applicant further submits, that if combined as suggested in the Office Action, the combination of Abjanic and Horn teaches a system that allows for multiple transactions to be retrieved based on a single ItemID. This is a distinct system and method from that which is claimed. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 1 is patentable and requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection.

Applicant further submits that amended independent claim 3 includes similar elements and is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Thus, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection and allowance of claim 3 is respectfully requested.

Reservation of Rights

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have equally addressed every assertion made in the Office Action, however, this does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record are relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of

the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6938 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6938


Date 25 June 08

By Janal M. Kalis
Janal M. Kalis
Reg. No. 37,650

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 25 day of June 2008.

Name

John D. Guck - Wostell


Signature